

# 16  
6/12/09

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP  
*A Delaware Limited Liability Partnership*  
500 Campus Drive  
Florham Park, New Jersey 07932-1047  
(973) 360-1100

Attorneys for Defendants

JOHNSON & JOHNSON, JOHNSON & JOHNSON  
PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH & DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C.,  
and ORTHO-McNEIL PHARMACEUTICAL, INC., now known as ORTHO-McNEIL-  
JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.

**FILED**

**JUN 12 2009**

Judge Jamie D. Happas

CHRISTINE DEVITE,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORTHO-McNEIL PHARMACEUTICAL,  
INC., JOHNSON & JOHNSON, JOHNSON  
& JOHNSON PHARMACEUTICAL  
RESEARCH and DEVELOPMENT, L.L.C.  
f/k/a R.W. JOHNSON  
PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH  
INSTITUTE, JANE DOE DISTRIBUTORS  
(1-50), JILL DOE MANUFACTURERS (1-  
50), JACK DOE WHOLESALERS (1-50),  
JAKE DOE SELLERS (1-50), JOHN DOE  
MARKETERS (1-50), JOAN DOE  
FORMULATORS (1-50), JIM DOE  
HEALTH CARE PROVIDERS (1-50), and  
JEAN DOE (1-50),

Defendants.

SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY  
LAW DIVISION: MIDDLESEX COUNTY  
DOCKET NUMBER: MID-L-10132-08-MT

CIVIL ACTION

IN RE ORTHO EVRA® BIRTH CONTROL  
PATCH LITIGATION  
CASE CODE 275

**SUMMARY JUDGMENT  
ORDER**


**THIS MATTER** having come before the Court by Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP,  
attorneys for Defendants Johnson & Johnson, Johnson & Johnson Pharmaceutical Research &  
Development, LLC, and Ortho-McNeil Pharmaceutical, Inc., now known as Ortho-McNeil-  
Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc. on application for summary judgment pursuant to R. 4:46, the

Court having considered this application, and good cause having been shown;

It is on this 12<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2009

**ORDERED** as follows:

1. Defendants' motion for summary judgment be and hereby is GRANTED;
2. Plaintiff's Complaint be and hereby is DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE; and
3. A copy of this Order shall be served upon all counsel of record within 7 days from the date of entry.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Hon. Jamie D. Happs, J.S.C.

This motion was:

     Opposed

X Unopposed

Having reviewed the above motion, I find it to be meritorious on its face and is unopposed. Pursuant to R.1:6-2, it therefore will be granted essentially for the reasons set forth in the moving papers.